UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/509,400	06/09/2005	Clyde James Barnes	PPD 50679	5701	
26748 7590 07/30/2008 SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, INC. PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT 410 SWING ROAD GREENSBORO, NC 27409			EXAMINER		
			ARNOLD, ERNST V		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1616		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/509,400	BARNES ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on t application, applicant must timely file one of the following re application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appear for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lat Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth i er than SIX MONTHS from the mailing). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extered under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shate forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nsion and the corresponding amount contened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further cons (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a constant.	sideration and/or search (see NOT /); er form for appeal by materially red	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): would be allowed the following rejection when the following rejection would be allowed the followed the following rejection would be allowed the followed the follow	.		
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided to the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 10. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over the state of the file of the fil	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (F 13. Other:			
/Johann R. Richter/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616	7/24/08		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that the primary reference of Moreno teaches away from preparing aqueous solutions and in the 52 different formulation examples water is not taught. The Examiner cannot agree. Moreno et al. clearly teach taking the composition in a bag and dissolving it in water to make an aqueous solution (column 10, line 47). The amount of required water used is dependent upon use which is readily determined by one of ordinary skill in the art of herbicidal compositions. Moreno et al. clearly teach that the bags are thrown into the needed amount of water where the polymer bag disappears with 2 minutes and the herbicide composition is dissolved completely or is dispersed in the water to give a composition which can be used directly in the field (column 19, lines 12-29). Moreno et al. also teach that an effective amount of the composition according to the invention can be dispersed on plants in the form of aqueous or water organic solvent solutions or dispersions or suspension (column 10, lines 48-55). Finally, Moreno et al. teach one embodiment where compositions 11.34 or 11.36 were dispersed in water (column 24, lines 65-67). The Examiner can only conclude that, contrary to Applicant's assertions, Moreno et al. clearly contemplate, teach and suggest aqueous solutions of the compositions. Claims 1 and 3-23 remain rejected for the reasons of record and those stated above.